UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,265	04/15/1999	THOMAS J. OLSON	25771	3301

23494 7590 03/24/2004

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER	
WONG, ALLEN C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 19

Application Number: 09/292,265
Filing Date: April 15, 1999
Appellant(s): OLSON, THOMAS J.

Robert D. Marshall
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/12/04.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is substantially correct. However, after further consideration of the persuasive arguments presented by the applicant about claims 17 and 54 in Group XII, the examiner objects to claims 17 and 54 as having allowable subject matter.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 15-17, 22, 25, 27, 29, 40-43, 46-49, 52-54 and 56 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Group I	claims 1 and 22;
Group II	claims 3 and 40;
Group III	claims 4 and 41;
Group IV	claims 5 and 42;
Group V	claims 6 and 43;
Group VI	claims 9 and 46;
Group VII	claims 10 and 47;
Group VIII	claims 11 and 48;
Group IX	claims 12 and 49;
Group X	claims 15 and 32;
Group XI	claims 16 and 53;
Group XII	claims 17 and 54;
Group XIII	claims 25 and 29;
Group XIV	claims 27 and 56.

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,069,655	SEELEY ET AL	5-2000
5,961,571	GORR ET AL	10-1999
5,425,139	WILLIAMS ET AL	6-1995
5,966,074	BAXTER	10-1999

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 15-17, 22, 25, 29, 40-43, 46-49 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeley (6,069,655) and Gorr (5,961,571) in view of Williams (5,425,139).

Regarding claim 29, Seeley discloses an apparatus for monitoring an area, comprising:

a detector which is operative to periodically detect an image of the area (note in figure 2, there are numerous cameras 22 monitoring and detecting successive images; also in figure 7, element 22 obtains the successive images and sends them to image processor 30 where there image detection is done in element 34); and

an image processing section which is responsive to the detector and which is operative to (fig.2, element 30 is an image processor and that element 36 is responsive to the detecting section 34):

identify and track a moving object in a succession of the detected images (figure 7, element 36; note Seeley discloses the evaluation of images where the events and objects are identified, tracked, recognized and labeled; also note that Seeley

teaches the ability to compare frames to determine whether or not there is an alarm condition as disclosed col.12, lines 22-29);

automatically select a single image of each identified object utilizing selection criteria (col.10, lines 19-31; Seeley discloses the selection of the identifying object information by using selection criteria, panning, tilting, or zooming into the identifying information in an event of interest; also note log or list of the saved identifying information is generated);

save the selected portion of the single image of the succession of detected images for each identified object (col.15, lines 24-30; Seeley discloses the selection of image information from the succession of detected images; further, Seeley discloses the storing or saving of the image information into picture buffer 40 of figure 7); and

automatically save information which identifies the path of movement of each moving object, and to retain the information after the moving object ceases to be present in current detected images (Seeley discloses the saving of information in fig.7, element 40 and also the retrieval of information can be done by operator or the computer residing at the central station CS).

Seeley does not disclose the limitation of "discard and not save detected images other than said single image of the succession of the detected images for each identified object". However, Gorr teaches the deletion or the discarding of redundant or non-essential image information (col.3, lines 45-55; Gorr focuses on saving the most important target image information while deleting image information that is not within the

specified ring area or the target image area). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the teachings of Seeley and Gorr, as a whole, for maximizing the storage capacity and unload any unnecessary image information. Doing so would improve lower the financial costs and permit efficient image processing in intrusion monitoring applications.

Although Seeley and Gorr does not specifically teach the use of a series of Cartesian coordinate pairs for identifying the object's movement path, however, Williams teaches the use of a series of Cartesian coordinate pairs for identifying the object's movement path (see fig.1 and 7, also see claim 1; Williams discloses that the object can be displayed on a Cartesian coordinate plane, where (0,0), (200,0), (0,200) and (200,200) are Cartesian coordinates that are the vertices of the Cartesian coordinate plane). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seeley, Gorr and Williams for permitting the computation, identification, storage and display of the objects in the Cartesian coordinate plane so as to clearly identify the objects at their specific locations. Doing so would convey accurate, precise detailed description of the moving objects' trajectory for reporting intrusion scenes.

Note claims 1, 22 and 25 have similar corresponding elements.

Regarding claims 3-6, 9-12 and 40-43 and 46-49, Seeley discloses the selection criteria to determine what kind of event is the intrusion (col.5, line 58 to col.6, line 2; note Seeley discloses that certain alarm conditions need to be met before indicating the presence of an intruder; col.6, lines 32-41, Seeley discloses saving of the time of

intrusion and other historical data; col.11, line 42, Seeley discloses the image is continually or periodically updated). Also, Seeley discloses the selecting of an image that is larger than other images in a set of images (col.10, lines 19-31; note Seeley discloses that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box appears on the object or scene of interest). As stated above, Seeley does not disclose the discarding of images. However, Gorr teaches the deletion or the discarding of redundant or non-essential image information (col.3, lines 45-55; Gorr focuses on saving the most important target image information while deleting image information that is not within the specified ring area or the target image area). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the teachings of Seeley and Gorr, as a whole, for maximizing the storage capacity and unload any unnecessary image information. Doing so would economically decrease the financial costs and allow fast, accurate image processing in intrusion monitoring tasks.

Regarding claims 15 and 52, Seeley discloses the saving of the detected image that corresponds to a bounding box (figure 7, element 40; figures 13-14, element note elements 406a-406n and 506a-506n are video buffers; in col.10, lines 19-31, Seeley discloses the that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box appears on the object or scene of interest).

Regarding claims 16, 17, 53 and 54, Seeley discloses the image resolution of the reference image saved at a first resolution and at a second resolution higher than the

first (note in figure 8B, the reference image is saved at a first resolution, a thumbnail image with a lower resolution where as in figure 8A, the reference image is saved at higher resolution, at "full resolution"). Also, Seeley's figure 15, element 602 is a display device. Seeley discloses the display of the reference image at a higher resolution in figure 15, element 602c and the display of the reference image at a lower resolution in figure 15, element 602b, where Y is the thumbnail image selected for being separately viewed in 602c.

1. Claims 27 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeley (6,069,655), Gorr (5,961,571) and Williams (5,425,139) in view of Baxter (5,966,074).

Regarding claims 27 and 56, Seeley discloses the storage of image information (figure 7, element 40; figures 13-14, element note elements 406a-406n and 506a-506n are video buffers) and the display of image information (figure 15, element 602). Seeley discloses that the CAC (central alarm computer) maintains a event log for each tour that contains information on when the cameras were used to track images, as disclosed in column 10, lines 28-31. Seeley discloses the display that can be used for displaying intrusion information (fig.15, element 602), like event labels, intrusion image, etc. Seeley and Gorr do not specifically disclose the display of the path of movement of the object or intruder. However, Baxter teaches the display of the trajectory or path of movement of the intruder (col.1, lines 43-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Seeley, Gorr and Baxter for permitting the display of the intruder's trajectory so as to accurately retrace the

intruder's actions. Doing so would provide strong evidentiary support of the intruder's unlawful entry on the premises.

(11) Response to Argument

Group I

Regarding lines 3-6 on page 6 of appellant's arguments, appellant asserts that Seeley's citation of panning, tilting or zooming a selected camera does not disclose or make obvious automatic selection of a portion of an image including an identified object. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, after careful perusal of the examiner's citation, Seeley states "When viewing of one scene is completed, another camera is selected by the operator or CAC." Note Seeley discloses that "the operator or the CAC", where the CAC is the central alarm computer as noted in Seeley's column 8, lines 20-21, can select another camera where the other camera is focusing on another image. The CAC or the central alarm computer is clearly controlling the selection of an image when the operator is not in manual control. And since Seeley teaches that can be in either manual control (ie. operator) or automatic control (ie. CAC, central alarm computer), the examiner is relying on Seeley's teaching of a CAC to meet the claimed limitations of the automatically selected image. Furthermore, Seeley also teaches that the CAC can automatically pan tilt or zoom images and the generation of a log or list of the saved identifying information, as evidenced by Seeley's column 10, lines 19-31 citation.

Secondly, In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958), the aforementioned court case specifically discloses that to make "automatic" is obvious and not considered a

novelty because to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity serve the same purpose and provide the same results. In re Rundell, 18 CCPA 1290, 48 F.2d 958, 9 USPQ 220.

Regarding the last paragraph on page 6 of appellant's arguments, appellant contends that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the "saving the selected portion of the single image of the succession of detected images for each identified object". The examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears the appellant has misconstrued the teachings of Seeley in an attempt to dissuade the Board from fully acknowledging the known teachings of Seeley. Seeley clearly teaches "saving the selected portion of the single image of the succession of detected images for each identified object", as disclosed in col.15, lines 24-30 and fig.7, picture buffer 40. As cited, Seeley discloses that "thumbnails" are taken and transmitted to a location like a workstation for storage so that the "thumbnails" can be retrieved at a later time for viewing. Also, in the aforementioned citation, Seeley discloses that the image can be identified manually or automacally, which can also be seen in col.10, ln.19-31. Seeley discloses that the images can be obtained and identified by either the operator or by automatic means as disclosed in col.10, ln.26-28, where cameras can be "preprogrammed" for automatic identification, not manually.

In addition, court case, In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958), specifically discloses that to make "automatic" is obvious and not considered novel because to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity that serves the same purpose and provide the same results. In re Rundell, 18 CCPA 1290, 48 F.2d

958, 9 USPQ 220. In other words, both manual activity and automatic activity achieve the same goal, and thus, there are no unexpected results to show the novelty of "automatic" actions.

Group II

Regarding lines 2-4 on page 9 on appellant's arguments, appellant argues that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the detecting of a "visible and large" image of a person's face. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Again, the appellant has erroneously interpreted the citations of Seeley. Clearly, the appellant is flat out wrong in their attempt to explain the written citation of col.5, ln.58 to col.6, ln.2, where the detection of intruders clearly involve detecting humans, and in this recognition process of whether the intruder is human or not human, a facial recognition must be done to determine whether the intruder is human or not. The intruder's face is the most crucial element in detecting intruders and in Seeley's fig.7, there is an image processor that contains a recognition & object labeling section (36) for having a database and programs for further image analysis processes in intruder recognition. Further, in col.10, ln.19-31 and col.16, ln.50 to col.17, ln.7, Seeley discloses either the operator or the CAC can zoom in the camera to the object of interest, ie. face of the human intruder, so that one can obtain a zoomed in image of the object of interest or human face, in this instance, to obtain a "visible and large" human face or highlight the intruder's face. Thus, Seeley clearly discloses the detecting of a "visible and large" image of a person's face.

Group III

Regarding lines 8-11 on page 10 of appellant's arguments, appellant argues that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the lowermost side or the size of a bounding box for a given change region. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley's col.10, lines 19-31 discloses that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box must appear on the object or scene of interest to highlight the object or scene of interest, where a bounding box can be focused on the lowermost side of the bounding box or the size of the bounding box. When a panning operation, a tilting operation or a zooming operation takes place, a bounding box must appear to highlight the area of interest to prepare for panning, tilting or zooming. When zooming operation occurs on an image area of interest, a bounding box appears where the bounding box can vary in size if necessary to obtain the object or areas of interest. Thus, Seeley meets the broad limitations of the claims.

Further, in lines 18-21 on page 10, appellant states that Seeley does not disclose the "discarding portions of images...." In the above rejection, the examiner has already stated that Seeley does not disclose the "discarding portions of images..." So, as stated above, the examiner relies on Gorr to teach the deletion or the discarding of redundant or non-essential image information (col.3, lines 45-55; Gorr focuses on saving the most important target image information while deleting image information that is not within the specified ring area or the target image area). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the teachings of

Seeley and Gorr, as a whole, for maximizing the storage capacity and unload any unnecessary image information. Doing so would economically decrease the financial costs and allow fast, accurate image processing in intrusion monitoring tasks.

Group IV

Regarding lines 1-4 on page 11 of appellant's arguments, appellant asserts that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the selection of a prior portion of an image over a current portion of an image based upon the portion having the lowermost point of images. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col.15, ln.25-37, Seeley discloses the selection of a prior portion of an image over a current portion of an image based upon the portion having the lowermost point of images, where the operator can select the prior thumbnail that contains the prior image portion for viewing if the operator desires to, as well as the change in size or "blowing up" the image size for viewing.

Group V

Regarding lines 10-14 on page 11 of appellant's arguments, appellant contends that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest image selection criteria which cause a current image to be selected over a prior image if a detected change region has increased in size relative to a prior image or in other words, a change in the current image with respect to the previous image, or an alarm condition. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley discloses in col.15, ln.10-17, that the selection of current image data over the prior image data is done when the presence of an alarm condition or intruder alert occurs. Also, Seeley discloses the

selection criteria to determine what kind of event is the intrusion (col.5, line 58 to col.6, line 2; note Seeley discloses that certain alarm conditions need to be met before indicating the presence of an intruder; col.6, lines 32-41, Seeley discloses saving of the time of intrusion and other historical data; col.11, line 42, Seeley discloses the image is continually or periodically updated). Also, Seeley discloses the selecting of an image that is larger than other images in a set of images (col.10, lines 19-31; note Seeley discloses that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box appears on the object or scene of interest). Also, peruse Seeley's col.16, ln.56 to col.17, ln.27. Thus, the broad limitations are met.

Group VI

Regarding the bottom paragraph of page 11 of appellant's arguments, appellant argues that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the detection of the absence of a previously detected object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley discloses the selection criteria to determine what kind of event is the intrusion (col.5, line 58 to col.6, line 2; note Seeley discloses that certain alarm conditions need to be met before indicating the presence of an intruder; col.6, lines 32-41, Seeley discloses saving of the time of intrusion and other historical data; col.11, line 42, Seeley discloses the image is continually or periodically updated). Also, Seeley discloses the selecting of an image that is larger than other images in a set of images (col.10, lines 19-31; note Seeley discloses that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of

interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box appears on the object or scene of interest). Also, peruse Seeley's col.16, ln.56 to col.17, ln.27, where the use of loops where the stored image data is used for comparing the current image data to determine if an alarm condition is present. For instance, if the current image does not have a previously detected object located in the previous image, then there is cause for alarm. Thus, Seeley discloses the broad limitations of the claims.

Group VII

Regarding lines 14-17 on page 12 of appellant's arguments, appellant states that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the event of an object remaining within a region for a length of time. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col.16, ln.56 to col.17, ln.27, Seeley discloses the use of time loops where the stored image data is used for comparing the current image data to determine if an alarm condition, ie. if object is moved or stationary, is present over a period or length of time. For instance, if the current image does not have a previously detected object located in the previous image, then there is cause for alarm. Also, see Seeley's col.11, ln.13-37, where time periods can be set to determine if a previously detected object remains within a region for a period of time. Thus, Seeley discloses the broad limitations of the claims.

Group VIII

Regarding lines 28-29 on page 12 of appellant's arguments, appellant asserts that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the event of a moving object stopping. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col.16,

ln.56 to col.17, ln.27, Seeley discloses the use of time loops where the stored image data is used for comparing the current image data to determine if an alarm condition, ie. if object is moved or stationary, is present over a period or length of time. For instance, if the current image does not have a previously detected object located in the previous image, then there is cause for alarm. Also, see Seeley's col.11, ln.13-37, where time periods can be set to determine if an object remains within a region for a period of time to observe if a previously detected object has been moved or stationary. Thus, Seeley discloses the broad limitations of the claims.

Group IX

Regarding lines 11-12 on page 13 of appellant's arguments, appellant asserts that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the event of a stationary object beginning to move. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col.16, ln.56 to col.17, ln.27, Seeley discloses the use of time loops where the stored image data is used for comparing the current image data to determine if an alarm condition, ie. if object is moved or stationary, is present over a period or length of time. For instance, if the current image does not have a previously detected object located in the previous image, then there is cause for alarm. Also, see Seeley's col.11, ln.13-37, where time periods can be set to determine if an object remains within a region for a period of time to observe if a previously detected object has been moved or stationary. Thus, Seeley discloses the broad limitations of the claims.

Group X

Regarding lines 2-4 on page 14 of appellant's arguments, appellant contends that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the zoom goes to the point that display is just large enough to completely contain the detected object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley discloses the saving of the detected image that corresponds to a bounding box, where figure 7, element 40 and figs.13-14, elements 406a-406n and 506a-506n are video buffers that can store or save the image data. And in col.10, lines 19-31, Seeley discloses the that either the operator or the CAC, central alarm computer, can zoom in the camera on the desired object or scene of interest, and when an object is zoomed, a bounding box appears on the object or scene of interest. Further, in col.15, ln.37-39, Seeley discloses the object can be obtained as a full size image or a zoomed in large image that fully or completely encompasses the detected object. Thus, the broad limitations of the claims are met.

Group XI

Regarding lines 21-23 on page 14 of appellant's arguments, appellant contends that Seeley does not disclose that any image saved is limited to the bounding box enclosing an identified object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley discloses the image resolution of the reference image saved at a first resolution and at a second resolution higher than the first, as noted in figure 8B, where the reference image is saved at a first resolution, a thumbnail image with a lower resolution where as in figure 8A, the reference image is saved at higher resolution, at "full resolution". Also, Seeley's figure 15, element 602 is a display device. Seeley discloses the display of the reference image at a higher resolution in figure 15, element 602c and the display of the reference

image at a lower resolution in figure 15, element 602b, where Y is the thumbnail image selected for being separately viewed in 602c. Also, in col.15, ln.24-30, Seeley discloses the "thumbnails" are saved and can be selected for viewing as a detected object that incorporates the bounding box enclosing the detected or identified object, and the identified object can be viewed as a full sized image for fully viewing the entire identified object (col.15, ln.37-39). Thus, the broad limitations are met.

Group XII

As stated above, after perusing the appellant's arguments about claims 17 and 54, the examiner finds the appellant's arguments persuasive, and thus, the examiner has objected to claims 17 and 54 as containing allowable subject matter.

Group XIII

Regarding lines 1-4 on page 19 of appellant's arguments, appellant contends that Seeley's citation of panning, tilting or zooming a selected camera does not disclose or make obvious automatic selection of a portion of an image including an identified object. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, after careful perusal of the examiner's citation, Seeley states "When viewing of one scene is completed, another camera is selected by the operator or CAC." Note Seeley discloses that "the operator or the CAC", where the CAC is the central alarm computer as noted in Seeley's column 8, lines 20-21, can select another camera where the other camera is focusing on another image. The CAC or the central alarm computer is clearly controlling the selection of an image when the operator is not in manual control. And since Seeley teaches that can be in either manual control (ie.

operator) or automatic control (ie. CAC, central alarm computer), the examiner is relying on Seeley's teaching of a CAC to meet the claimed limitations of the automatically selected image. Furthermore, Seeley also teaches that the CAC can automatically pan tilt or zoom images and the generation of a log or list of the saved identifying information, as evidenced by Seeley's column 10, lines 19-31 citation.

Secondly, In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958), the aforementioned court case specifically discloses that to make "automatic" is obvious and not considered a novelty because to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity serve the same purpose and provide the same results. In re Rundell, 18 CCPA 1290, 48 F.2d 958, 9 USPQ 220.

Regarding lines 14-17 on page 19 of appellant's arguments, appellant asserts that that the combination of Seeley, Gorr in view of Williams does not teach or suggest the "saving the selected portion of the single image of the succession of detected images for each identified object". The examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears the appellant has misconstrued the teachings of Seeley in an attempt to dissuade the Board from fully acknowledging the known teachings of Seeley. Seeley clearly teaches "saving the selected portion of the single image of the succession of detected images for each identified object", as disclosed in col.15, lines 24-30 and fig.7, picture buffer 40. As cited, Seeley discloses that "thumbnails" are taken and transmitted to a location like a workstation for storage so that the "thumbnails" can be retrieved at a later time for viewing. Also, in the aforementioned citation, Seeley discloses that the image can be identified manually or automacally, which can also be seen in col.10, ln.19-31. Seeley

discloses that the images can be obtained and identified by either the operator or by automatic means as disclosed in col.10, ln.26-28, where cameras can be "preprogrammed" for automatic identification, not manually. Additionally, Seeley's thumbnails are taught as corresponding to the detected objects as claimed (col.15, ln.4-30; Seeley discloses the object correspond to the detected objects for the operator to review in search of intruders).

In addition, court case, In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958), specifically discloses that to make "automatic" is obvious and not considered novel because to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity that serves the same purpose and provide the same results. In re Rundell, 18 CCPA 1290, 48 F.2d 958, 9 USPQ 220. In other words, both manual activity and automatic activity achieve the same goal, and thus, there are no unexpected results to show the novelty of "automatic" actions.

Regarding lines 10-11 on page 21 of appellant's arguments, appellant states that Williams does not teach or suggest the technique of tracking object coordinates is different. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Williams teaches the use of a series of Cartesian coordinate pairs for identifying the object's movement path (see fig.1 and 7, also see claim 1; Williams discloses that the object can be displayed on a Cartesian coordinate plane, where (0,0), (200,0), (0,200) and (200,200) are Cartesian coordinates that are the vertices of the Cartesian coordinate plane). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seeley, Gorr and Williams for permitting the computation,

identification, storage and display of the objects in the Cartesian coordinate plane so as to clearly identify the objects at their specific locations. Doing so would convey accurate, precise detailed description of the moving objects' trajectory for reporting intrusion scenes. Since Seeley, Gorr and Williams pertain to the same image processing environment, it is reasonable to combine the teachings as a whole.

Regarding lines 17-19 on page 21 of appellant's arguments, appellant states that Williams does not teach or suggest the storage of coordinates of a detected moving object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The storage of coordinates is an inherent if not, then it is an extremely, notoriously well known feature in image storage. Since Seeley discloses the image buffers (fig.7, element 51) for storing images, where images must have coordinates to provide the specific locations of interest, so they are saved in Seeley. However, since Seeley does not specifically disclose the use of Cartesian coordinates, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seeley, Gorr and Williams for permitting the computation, identification, storage and display of the objects in the Cartesian coordinate plane so as to clearly identify the objects at their specific locations. Doing so would convey accurate, precise detailed description of the moving objects' trajectory for reporting intrusion scenes.

Group XIV

Regarding lines 23-26 on page 22 of appellant's arguments, appellant argues that neither Seeley, Gorr, Williams nor Baxter, taken separately or as a whole, teach or disclose display of event labels on a reference image at a location on the reference

image corresponding to a location of the event. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Seeley discloses the storage of image information in fig. 7, element 40, figs. 13-14, where elements 406a-406n and 506a-506n are video buffers. Also, Seeley discloses the display of image information in fig. 15, element 602. Seeley discloses that the CAC (central alarm computer) maintains a event log for each tour that contains information on when the cameras were used to track images, as disclosed in column 10, lines 28-31. Seeley discloses the display that can be used for displaying intrusion information (fig.15, element 602), like event labels, intrusion image, etc. Also, in fig.7, Seeley discloses a recognition and object labeling section (fig.7, element 36 labels events corresponding to a location on a reference image as shown in fig.15, element 602, where image of the detected object is shown in 602b and 602c and the event label is shown in 602a and 602d). The labeling provides evidence of the intruder's unlawful entry on the premises. Thus, the broad limitations are met.

In conclusion, it is clear, evident and elucidated that the remaining claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 15-16, 22, 25, 27, 29, 40-43, 46-49, 52-53 and 56 are not patentable as elaborated above. The examiner implores the Board of Appeals to maintain the rejection for the aforementioned claims.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Wong
Examiner
Art Unit 2613

AW
March 17, 2004

Conferees

ANDY RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600